



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/829,656	04/10/2001	Sherran Irene Brewer	PU3985US2	9192
23347	7590	09/21/2004	EXAMINER	
DAVID J LEVY, CORPORATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY			DURAN, ARTHUR D	
GLAXOSMITHKLINE				
FIVE MOORE DR., PO BOX 13398			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709-3398			3622	

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/829,656	BREWER ET AL. <i>of</i>	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Arthur Duran	3622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 April 2001.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/5/04.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-16 have been examined.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 6-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. These claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because these claims have no connection to the technological arts. The method claims do not specify how the claims utilize any technological arts. For example, no network or server is specified. To overcome this rejection, the Examiner recommends that the Applicant amend the claim to specify or to better clarify that the method is utilizing a medium or apparatus, etc within the technological arts. Appropriate correction is required.

As an initial matter, the United States Constitution under Art. I, §8, cl. 8 gave Congress the power to "[p]romote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries". In carrying out this power, Congress authorized under 35 U.S.C. §101 a grant of a patent to "[w]hoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof." Therefore, a fundamental premise is that a patent is a statutorily created vehicle for Congress to confer an exclusive right to the inventors for "inventions" that promote the progress of "science and the useful arts". The

phrase "technological arts" has been created and used by the courts to offer another view of the term "useful arts". See *In re Musgrave*, 167 USPQ (BNA) 280 (CCPA 1970). Hence, the first test of whether an invention is eligible for a patent is to determine if the invention is within the "technological arts".

Further, despite the express language of §101, several judicially created exceptions have been established to exclude certain subject matter as being patentable subject matter covered by §101. These exceptions include "laws of nature", "natural phenomena", and "abstract ideas". See *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450, U.S. 175, 185, 209 USPQ (BNA) 1, 7 (1981). However, courts have found that even if an invention incorporates abstract ideas, such as mathematical algorithms, the invention may nevertheless be statutory subject matter if the invention as a whole produces a "useful, concrete and tangible result." See *State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group, Inc.* 149 F.3d 1368, 1973, 47 USPQ2d (BNA) 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

This "two prong" test was evident when the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals (CCPA) decided an appeal from the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (BPAI). See *In re Toma*, 197 USPQ (BNA) 852 (CCPA 1978). In *Toma*, the court held that the recited mathematical algorithm did not render the claim as a whole non-statutory using the Freeman-Walter-Abele test as applied to *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 175 USPQ (BNA) 673 (1972). Additionally, the court decided separately on the issue of the "technological arts". The court developed a "technological arts" analysis:

The "technological" or "useful" arts inquiry must focus on whether the claimed subject matter...is statutory, not on whether the product of the claimed subject matter...is statutory, not on whether the prior art which the claimed subject matter purports to replace...is statutory, and not on whether the claimed subject matter is presently perceived to be an improvement over the prior art, e.g., whether it "enhances" the operation of a machine. *In re Toma* at 857.

In *Toma*, the claimed invention was a computer program for translating a source human language (e.g., Russian) into a target human language (e.g., English). The court found that the claimed computer implemented process was within the "technological art" because the claimed invention was an operation being performed by a computer within a computer.

The decision in *State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group, Inc.* never addressed this prong of the test. In *State Street Bank & Trust Co.*, the court found that the "mathematical exception" using the Freeman-Walter-Abele test has little, if any, application to determining the presence of statutory subject matter but rather, statutory subject matter should be based on whether the operation produces a "useful, concrete and tangible result". See *State Street Bank & Trust Co.* at 1374. Furthermore, the court found that there was no "business method exception" since the court decisions that purported to create such exceptions were based on novelty or lack of enablement issues and not on statutory grounds. Therefore, the court held that "[w]hether the patent's claims are too broad to be patentable is not to be judged under §101, but rather under §§102, 103 and 112." See *State Street Bank & Trust Co.* at 1377. Both of these analysis goes towards whether the claimed invention is non-statutory because of the presence of an abstract idea. Indeed, *State Street* abolished the Freeman-Walter-Abele test used in *Toma*. However, *State Street* never addressed the second part of the analysis, i.e., the "technological arts" test established in *Toma* because the invention in *State Street* (i.e., a computerized system for determining the year-end income, expense, and capital gain or loss for the portfolio) was already determined to be within the technological arts under the *Toma* test. This dichotomy has been recently acknowledged by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (BPAI) in

affirming a §101 rejection finding the claimed invention to be non-statutory. See *Ex parte Bowman*, 61 USPQ2d (BNA) 1669 (BdPatApp&Int 2001).

In the current application, no technological art (i.e., computer, network, server) is being utilized by claims 6-16. At least one step of the body of the claims must explicitly utilize the technological arts. All steps of the body of the cited claims can be performed manually by a human. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 1, 2, 4-7, 9-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Postrel (6,594,640) in view of Ouimet (6,308,162).

Claim 1, 4, 6, 9, 11-16: Postrel discloses a computer program product, method, comprising:

a computer storage medium and a computer program code mechanism embedded in the computer storage medium for causing a computer to control an analysis of compliance with a contract, the computer program code mechanism comprising:

a first computer code device configured to read in rules associated with a contract (Fig. 4; Fig. 5; Fig. 6)

Art Unit: 3622

a second computer code device configured to read in performance milestones associated with the rules of the contract (Fig. 4; Fig. 5; Fig. 6; col 11, lines 1-45); and

a third computer code device configured to compare the performance milestones against the rules of the contract (col 11, lines 1-45).

Postrel further discloses measuring if a participant is within a predetermined amount of achieving a next milestone (col 11, lines 30-60); and

notifying at least one of a participant and a contract manager of an amount needed to achieve the next milestone (col 11, line 60-col 12, line 9; col 11, lines 5-13; col 3, lines 30-55).

Postrel further discloses reading in a current compliance level with the contract (col 11, lines 4-12);

displaying the current compliance level with the contract (Fig. 3; Fig. 5 );

displaying a rebate opportunity associated with the modified compliance level (col 12, lines 23-31).

Postrel further discloses notifying the user of different rebates available (col 3, lines 14-20).

Postrel further discloses that the value or amount of purchases to acquire rebates can be increased or decreased (col 11, lines 4-9; col 10, lines 50-58).

Postrel further discloses changing parameters associated with compliance (col 12, lines 15-31; col 11, lines 4-11).

Postrel does not explicitly disclose simulating a change in the current compliance level to a modified compliance level.

However, Ouimet discloses simulating a change in the current compliance level to a modified compliance level (Fig. 1; Fig. 2; Fig. 3; Fig. 4b; Fig. 5a-5c; Fig. 11; col 1, lines 24-35; col 1, lines 48-52; col 6, lines 2-11).

Ouimet further discloses modeling the affect of a host of business related decisions on business objectives (col 1, lines 24-35; col 1, lines 48-52; col 6, lines 2-11).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add Ouimet's predicting the influence of changing parameters to Postrel's changeable parameters. One would have been motivated to do this in order to provide better business decision analysis tools before actually enacting the decisions.

Claim 2, 7: Postrel and Ouimet disclose the computer program product as claimed in claim 1, wherein the third computer code device comprises a fourth computer code device configured to measure if a participant is entitled to a rebate (col 11, lines 4-11).

Claim 5, 10: Postrel and Ouimet disclose the computer program product as claimed in claim 4, wherein the fourth computer code device comprises a fifth computer code device configured to send a notification to a sales representative if a participant is within a predetermined amount of achieving a next milestone (col 11, lines 24-36; col 8, lines 47-55).

4. Claims 3, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Postrel (6,594,640) in view of Ouimet (6,308,162) in further view of Peirce (6,332,126).

Claim 3, 8: Postrel and Ouimet disclose the computer program product as claimed in claim 1.

Postrel further discloses monitoring consumer activities and setting up minimums or rules in order to receive rebates (Fig. 5; Fig. 6; col 11, lines 4-11).

Postrel does not explicitly disclose that the third computer code device comprises a fourth computer code device configured to measure if a participant is in breach of a contract sales amount.

However, Peirce discloses that the third computer code device comprises a fourth computer code device configured to measure if a participant is in breach of a contract sales amount (col 7, lines 15-20; col 6, lines 9-14; col 13, lines 1-5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add Peirce's specifically set contract sales amount to Postrel's requirement to qualify for certain benefits. One would have been motivated to do this in order to provide better precision as to benefits requirements.

### ***Conclusion***

The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- a. Mori (5,200,889) discloses rebates upon requirement meeting;
- b. Schultz (5,056,019) discloses rebates upon requirement meeting;
- c. Cohen (4,750,119) discloses rebates upon requirement meeting;
- d. Feidelson (6,345,261) discloses rebates upon requirement meeting;
- e. Fernandez-Holmann (5,787,404) discloses rebates upon requirement meeting;
- f. Finsterwald (6,039,244) discloses rebates upon requirement meeting;

Art Unit: 3622

- g. Eggleston (6,061,660) discloses rebates upon requirement meeting;
- h. Perkowski (5,950,173) discloses rebates upon requirement meeting;
- i. Verba (6,236,977) discloses rebates upon requirement meeting and business modeling;
- j. Rebane (6,539,392) discloses rebates upon requirement meeting;
- k. Holda-Fleck (5,729,693) discloses rebates upon requirement meeting.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arthur Duran whose telephone number is (703)305-4687. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon- Fri, 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on (703)305-8469. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



5/5/04